

226. b. 13.

monthly Review v. 38 p. 79

3.

D O U B T S
CONCERNING THE
Authenticity of the Last Publication
O F T H E
CONFESSIONAL, ^{1/2.}
A N D T H E
CURRENT EDITIONS of CERTAIN BOOKS
C I T E D I N I T.

Addressed to the Author of that Learned Work.

— — — *The careful plowman doubting stands
Left on the threshing floor his hopeful sheaves
Prove chaff.* PARADISE LOST, book 4. v. 983.

L O N D O N :

Printed for JOHN and FRANCIS RIVINGTON; and sold by
D. PRINCE, in Oxford; and J. WOODYER, in Cambridge.

MDCCLXVII.

D O U B T S

CONCERNING THE

Authenticity of the Latin Application

OF THE

CONFESSIO

AND THE

CURRENT EDITIONS OF CERTAIN BOOKS

CITED IN IT



Addressed to the Learned Work

— The compiler has consulted the

list on the subject, for the purpose of

giving a list of the books, book 4. v. 93.

L O N D O N

Printed for John and Francis Rivington; and sold by
L. Prince, in Oyster, and J. Woodcut, in Cambridge.

MDCCLXXVII

TO THE AUTHOR OF

TO THE
A U T H O R

OF THE
C O N F E S S I O N A L.

S I R,

THE retirement in which I live affords me little opportunity of seeing any books, except the few which I have at home; and when I consult them as cited or referred to in your learned Confessional, and either can not find what is alledged, or find it totally different in them, I am not a little perplexed. Your character and strict adherence to probity and truth considered, how can I account for such variation, but by supposing, till the difficulty is cleared up to me, that my editions of the authors in question are extremely faulty, and perhaps not genuine?

B

I WILL

2. TO THE AUTHOR OF

I WILL take the liberty to instance in some of the doubtful passages of my books; and then to mention to you a few things in the late edition of your own Work, which appear no less apocryphal.

You tell us, p. xxix. of the preface to the first edition, that King Charles II. promised, in his Declaration from Breda, two things concerning religion; the first of which was, “ *A quite new model of the Church of England.*”

IN all the copies which I have of this Declaration, the whole of what the King promised concerning religion is contained in the following paragraph:

“ AND because the passion and uncharitableness of the times have produced several opinions in religion, by which men are engaged in parties and animosities against each other; which, when they shall hereafter unite in a freedom of conversation, will be composed or better understood; We do declare a liberty to tender consciences; and that no man shall be disquieted or called in question

THE CONFESSIONAL. 3

“ question for differences of opinion in matter
 “ of religion, which do not disturb the peace
 “ of the kingdom ; and that we shall be ready
 “ to consent to such an Act of Parliament, as
 “ upon mature deliberation shall be offered to
 “ us, for the full granting that indulgence.”

A large and comprehensive Toleration, which you mention as the King's *second* promise, is here indeed declared. But where do we meet with the *first*, *A quite new model of the Church of England*? I have searched, and searched for it in vain, in all my books, which give us the Declaration from Breda.

BUT I fear this is not the only royal Declaration, of which my copies are very imperfect,

A Declaration is prefixed to the Thirty-nine Articles, which you doubt whether to ascribe to James I. or Charles I, but seem rather inclinable to think it was set forth by the former.

HEYLIN in his *Life of Laud*, p. 188. has published this Declaration at length as King Charles's, referring in the margin to *Bibl.*

4 TO THE AUTHOR OF

Reg. Sect. 4. Num. 3. He gives also a very full and distinct account of the occasion, the time, and consequences of it.

PLAIFERE likewise in his *Appeal to the Gospel*, probably written very soon after the Declaration came forth, refers to it as King Charles's, and quotes the words of it* :

“ MOREOVER the King's most excellent Majesty *that now is*, in his Declaration, commanding that all further curious search be laid aside, willeth that *These disputes be shut up in God's promises, as they be generally set forth unto us in the Holy Scripture.*”

IN another place he says, that we are to arrive at the meaning of the Articles, “ By analysing the propositions, and scanning the literal and grammatical sense, to which we are bound to keep us, both by the law of learning, and by *the Declaration of King Charles prefixed to our Articles.*”

* See Tracts concerning Predestination, &c. Cambr. 1719. p. 201. 139.

FROM these and various other proofs that might be produced, it seems as clear as most points in history, that this Declaration is King Charles's; and no less than your great authority could make one hesitate a moment about it. But this is not the point: what surprises me, is the difference between the copies of a Declaration so well known in the world; that yours should want passages which mine contains, and have others that are wanting in mine*.

IN yours, it seems, his Majesty does not say, that "He caused a Declaration, made and published by himself, for the purposes mentioned in the Proclamation, to be printed and published along with the Thirty-nine Articles." p. 132. note.

BUT in mine, somebody hath made him speak to this purpose explicitly enough:

"We have therefore, upon mature deliberation, and with the advice of so many of our Bishops, as might conveniently be called to-

* See Dr. Z. Grey's Examination of the second Volume of Neal's History of the Puritans, p. 100—103.

gether

6 TO THE AUTHOR OF

" gether, thought fit to make this Declaration
 " following: That the Articles of the Church
 " of England (which have been allowed and
 " authorised heretofore, and which our Clergy
 " generally have subscribed unto) do contain
 " the true doctrine of the Church of England,
 " agreeable to God's word; which we do there-
 " fore ratifie and confirm, requiring all our
 " loving subjects to continue in the uniform
 " profession thereof, and prohibiting the least
 " difference from the said Articles, *which to*
 " *that end we command to be reprinted, and this*
 " *our Declaration to be published therewith.*"

If this paragraph had been in your copy of
 the Declaration, I think it must have satisfied
 your demands upon his Majesty in the present
 point; else, notwithstanding your great accu-
 racy and clearness, I am so unfortunate as not
 to conceive what they are.

ON the other hand, there is a pretty remark-
 able particular in this Declaration *as you have it,*
 which I cannot discover in the common im-
 pressions of it. For in page 132, in the note
 lately referred to, you tell us: " That this De-
 " clARATION was published along with these re-
 " printed

THE CONFESSIONAL. 37

" printed Articles, appears from Sir *John Eliot's* speech in parliament the January following, who cites it thus: It is said (namely in a Declaration he had just mentioned) if there be any difference of opinion concerning the *seasonable* (perhaps *reasonable*) interpretation of the Thirty-nine Articles, the Bishops and Clergy in the Convocation have power to dispute it; and to order which way they please. Now (say you) *this particular is actually to be found in his Majesty's Declaration, as we now have it.*"

His Majesty in his Declaration, as I have it, says: "That We are Supreme Governour of the Church of England; and that if any difference arise about the external policy concerning injunctions, canons, or other constitutions whatsoever thereto belonging, the Clergy in their Convocation is to order and settle them, having first obtained leave under our broad seal so to do; and we approving their said ordinances and constitutions; provided that none be made contrary to the laws and customs of the land. That out of our princely care, that the Churchmen may do

the

" the work which is proper unto them, the
 " Bishops and Clergy, from time to time in
 " Convocation, upon their humble desire, shall
 " have licence under our broad seal, to delibe-
 " rate of and to do all such things, as being
 " made plain by them, and assented unto by us,
 " shall concern the settled continuance of the
 " doctrine and discipline of the Church of Eng-
 " land now established; from which we will
 " not endure any varying or departing in the
 " least degree.

THE part of the Declaration here alledged
 impowers the Bishops and Clergy in Convoca-
 tion, under certain limitations, to order and
 settle the *external policy* of the Church concern-
 ing *injunctions, canons, or other constitutions*
 thereto belonging; that is, belonging to the
external policy of the Church. But with regard
 to its *doctrine and essential discipline*, it impow-
 ers them only to act as guardians under the
 King; to deliberate of and to do all such things
 with his consent and approbation, as might con-
 cern the settled continuance of them; from
 which, says his Majesty, we will not endure
 any varying or departing in the least degree.

THE CONFESSIONAL. 9

THE restrictions, to which they were subject, are such, as not to leave them at liberty in either case *to order which way they pleased*. If they varied any thing in the *external policy* of the Church, the King was to judge how far their variation was expedient, and to give or deny authority to it. In the *doctrine* of the Church he declares he will admit of no variation from what was already established. In this respect they were commissioned no farther, than to study the best means of maintaining and securing, what was *ordered and settled* to their hands.

Now what they were to order and settle, is so different from what they were to guard and secure, that it could not possibly have escaped the notice of so exact a critic, who perfectly understands, and wishes others to observe, *The distinction between a Canon and an Article*. See p. 103. note x.

WHEN therefore you inform us, That the particular mentioned in Sir John Elliot's speech (a power delegated to the Bishops and Clergy in Convocation to order which way they pleased

C

concerning

concerning the interpretation of the Thirty-nine Articles) that this *is actually to be found in his Majesty's Declaration, as we now have it*, you must mean as you have it, in some copy of the Declaration which you esteem most authentic; for in the common books this particular is assuredly not to be found.

IT being thus evident, that both Declarations, as well that prefixed to the Thirty-nine Articles, as that from Breda, have been corrupted; I hope your admirable sagacity will enable you, and your great justice incite you, to detect the falsifiers of them, and bring these offenders to punishment. He indeed, who has only suppressed a royal permission to the Bishops and Clergy *to order which way they please*, may be recommended to mercy; but if the other can be apprehended, who hath stolen away the *Quite new model of the Church of England*, he will deserve the utmost severity of your * pen at its next *Auto da fe*.

* "If there be *starving*, as well as *burning*, let it be remembered that there are likewise *writing inquisitions*." See Essay on Establishments in Religion, p. 130.

THE CONFESSIONAL. 11

BUT let us descend from royal to private authors.

You say, p. 30, note c. of the Confessional:

“ THE late Bishop Conybeare, in his famous
“ subscription Sermon, argues from the consent
“ required by the Apostles to *their* doctrines,
“ to the consent required by succeeding Church
“ governours to *human* articles.”

BISHOP CONYBEARE is apt to lay a sure foundation, and to build regularly and firmly upon it. His stile and manner of building are indeed, as Masters differ, not much like the Confessional; but such as they are in his other productions, such they appear in this Sermon; in which, *as I have it*, there is not any the least trace of such argumentation, as is here imputed to him. And yet, as a true scholar does not judge of a discourse by reading only the title or text; nor a fair critic report, that it contains, what it does not contain: here is a difficulty which I know not how to solve; unless by supposing, that the current editions of this *famous* Sermon are not genuine; or were superseded by a later, in which the Bishop changed his

whole system; and, not being so happy in changing as Dr. Whitby, fell into absurdity in his *Last Thoughts*. See preface to the first edit. of Conf. p. xxxii. note.

SOME will think I have supposed what is very unlikely. But it is probable, says an * Ancient, that many things may happen contrary to probability. I shall therefore beg leave to recur again to the same hypothesis, it being again wanted, in respect of Dr. Waterland.

FOR p. 310, having accused Bishop Sanderson of justifying prevarication in a Case of Conscience which he determined, you then quote a passage from Dr. Waterland, and subjoin:
 “ This Case of Conscience, however, was in
 “ print before Waterland was born, and
 “ what is more, he *knew* it was. One may
 “ charitably hope indeed, he did not suspect it
 “ of defending prevarication; otherwise he
 “ would hardly have recommended these nine
 “ Cases of Conscience in his *Advice to young*
 “ *Students*.”

* See Aristotle's Poetics, ch. xviii.

IN consulting my edition of Dr. Waterland's *Advice to young Students*, I find the following passage, p. 26.

"PUFENDORF and Grotius are admirable books, and should be studied carefully; they are an excellent foundation for casuistical Divinity, and to them may be added Sander-son's *Prelections*, and Placette of Conscience."

THIS is all that Dr. Waterland says of Bishop Sanderfon in his *Advice to young Students*; and if he erred in this slight recommendation of a writer, whom the great Mr. Boyle so much admired as a casuist, he erred in recommending only one of his books, namely his *Prelections*, published by the Bishop himself; from which his *Nine Cases of Conscience* are as distinct a work, as Mr. Collins's *Historical and critical Essay on the Thirty-nine Articles*, which you several times quote, and seem in some respects to approve of, is distinct from his *Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion*. What then shall we say, when the most charitable man in the world so strongly insinuates, that Dr. Waterland hath misled our lettered youth by recommending to them

them false morality? Shall we say, that in some measure it hath fared with the writer of the Confessional, as it did with * William Rainoldes, who in confuting popery became a papist;

“ The victor flying to the vanquish’d side ;”
and that our grave censor hath chastised prevarication, till he himself is fallen in love with her, or with one of her near kindred, not more reputable than she? Forbid it virtue! and let the bright example of his own charity teach us better things; let the fault be laid where it ought, on the common editions of Dr. Waterland’s works; which in some articles are defective, as is plain by this, and in others redundant, as appears by the following instance.

PAGE 179, you cite this passage from his *Case of Arian subscription*. “ The sense of the
“ compilers, barely considered, is not always
“ to be observed; but so far only, as the natural
“ and proper signification of words, or the in-

* See Heylin’s *Cosmography* under article Britain, and Dr. Alabaster’s epigram on this subject there quoted and translated. See also *Delectus epigrammatum*, Lond. 1686. Appendix p. 5.

THE CONFESSIONAL. 15

“tention of the imposers binds it upon us.”
You add, “By imposers, I apprehend, must be
“meant the ministerial imposers, that is, the
“Bishops, they being the persons appointed by
“law to take this security of subscription, on
“behalf of the Church.”

THE DOCTOR, p. 11. begins a chapter with two sentences, which immediately precede the passage cited by you, and thus explains himself:

“By *compilers* I mean those that composed
“the creeds, articles, or other forms received
“by our Church. By *imposers* I understand
“the governours in Church and State for the
“time being.”

Now the Bishops not being *our governours in Church and State for the time being*, it is evident that the Doctor could not confine his view to them, when he *first* composed this, and indeed some of the following * chapters. He must, with the same ill luck as the good Bishop whom we lately mentioned, have had his

* See the Case of Arian subscription, p. 36, 39. answer to Plea xiv. &c.

last thoughts; or else a new publisher thought for him. The writer of the Confessional is too *fair* and *candid* to make a text of his own, and then with much triumph and pleasantry for several pages, to comment upon it as another's.

GIVE me leave, Sir, now to express my just apprehensions, that you yourself have not always been well used in the edition which I have of your learned work, printed in this current year; there being passages in it, which make you unsay in one place, what you have said in another. For example:

WHEN you are arguing against Bishop Burnet, who believed our Articles to have been framed by Cranmer and Ridley, you represent it as an uncertain point by whom they were composed; and add: "under this uncertainty, who can pretend to say with what temper they were composed, or by what views or considerations the composers were influenced?" p. 134.

BUT in your reasoning against Dr. Nicholls, who thinks that the Articles were purposely drawn

THE CONFESSIONAL. 17

drawn up in general terms, because they, who compiled and first subscribed them, were of different opinions, there is this passage:

“ BUT mark how a plain tale will destroy
“ this specious hypothesis. The Articles were
“ compiled by Cranmer; and at most with the
“ help of one or two of his particular friends;
“ and these out of all doubt were of one
“ mind.” p. 152.

THUS in the course of twenty pages, it is, first, *uncertain* by whom the Articles were composed; and then, secondly, as *certain*, that they were compiled by Cranmer; and at most with the help of one or two of his particular friends. And in the progress of the work it is asserted that, “ The presumptive proof is very strong, “ that Cranmer was the sole compiler of King Edward’s Articles. p. 232.

COULD these opposite assertions proceed from the consistent writer of the Confessional? I must rather believe that he hath trusted the publishing of his work to a friend, who not having sagacity to discern the fine connection of the

D

several

several parts, and the orderly train of reasoning, that prevails throughout, hath now and then thrown in somewhat of his own, and thus unluckily hath marred, what he hoped to mend.

THE following instance, though in a matter of no great moment, seems fully to justify the supposition :

PAGE 167. In an argument levelled against Dr. Bennet, I find this remark upon some position of the said Doctor : that it is " contrary " to his repeated interpretations in his directions, against the confinement of the words " themselves ; and contrary to his Majesty's " Declaration."

THE last argument cannot be yours ; who have repeatedly denied all authority to this Declaration ; who have told us that " *this rescript is of no manner of validity,*" p. 216. that, " *whatever weight it might have had in its day,*" " *it has evidently been of no force for above an*" " *hundred years past.*" p. 296.

YOUR friend, with more zeal than knowledge, might not well consider when Dr. Bennet lived ;

THE CONFESSIONAL. 19

lived; or how long the Declaration was in force; and so might hastily urge its authority against him in aggravation of his error. But you yourself could not rebuke him in this stile. The Declaration, you well know, hath had *its day*; and hath now lost not only all authority, but even *common sense*, by archi*****[rescript

Condemn'd to all eternity at once,
At ninety-nine an ancient and a dunce.

See p. 133.

The truth of what is supposed above will become still more notorious by another example:

THE xxiii Article says, "We ought to judge
" those lawfully called and sent, which be chosen
" and called to this work [of the Ministry] by
" men who have public authority given unto
" them in the Congregation to call and send
" Ministers."

UPON which, it seems, Dr. Nicholls hath observed: "There can be no doubt made, but
" that by public authority was meant the au-
" thority of Bishops."

20 TO THE AUTHOR OF

You subjoin: "But if no doubt can be made of this, what shall we say of those compilers who *perhaps*, and of those first subscribers who *certainly*, were wedded to Calvin's form of Church-discipline? Can any one say they held no opinion diverse from this interpretation? or can any one think that they would agree to the passing this Article, but that they thought it was conceived in such general terms that they might subscribe it with a good conscience, and without equivocation?"

"THESE are Dr. Nicholls's own questions, and any one has just as much right to ask them as he had." p. 160.

WHOSOEVER the questions originally were, they are here adopted as just and pertinent with respect to the xxiii Article, and are confirmed with reasonings to the same purpose.

As matters therefore are here stated, we are instructed:

1. THAT *perhaps* some of the *compilers* were wedded to Calvin's form of Church-discipline.

2. THAT

THE CONFESSIONAL. 21

2. THAT certainly some of the first subscribers were; and these subscribers had their weight and influence in the passing of the Articles.

3. THAT these first subscribers were men of conscience, hating equivocation, who would not have subscribed to any thing, but what they could fairly and honestly assent to.

4. HERE is an Article drawn up in such general terms, that persons of diverse opinions may assent to it; and both the Episcopalian, who contends that the authority of appointing Ministers is in the Bishop; and the Presbyterian, who asserts it is in the Elders of the Church; may subscribe it with a good conscience, and without equivocation.

LET us now take a view of these same matters as laid before us in other parts of the Confessional.

1. "THE Articles were compiled by Cranmer; and at most with the help of one or two of his particular friends; and these out of all doubt were of one mind." p. 152.

TAHT

CRANMER

CRANMER therefore may be considered, as he is in another place, as *the sole compiler of them*; who possibly might not object to Calvin's form of Church-discipline: but where do we learn, that *perhaps he was wedded to it?*

2. THE first subscribers had no synodical authority in ratifying the Articles; their whole business was to subscribe them. p. 152.

3. COURT-FAVOUR and Church-preferment made this matter easy; and with a view to these the majority was ready to comply, and to subscribe without regard to their own private judgement. p. 153.

4. No Article was purposely drawn up in general terms; for "if some of these Articles—
"we desire to know which of them? and how
"the Articles, which were purposely so drawn
"up, may be distinguished from those which
"were not?" p. 151.

5. "THE compilers of the Articles did not intend any latitude." p. 158.

"THAT

THE CONFESSIONAL. 23

“ THAT such latitude was really designed,
“ never has been, nor ever can be proved.”

p. 229.

THERE seems to be such inconsistency between these representations, that I cannot otherwise account for it, than by introducing your friend the Publisher into the drama: who, as we may reasonably judge, again makes his appearance on the stage to utter the following sentiment concerning Bishop Burnet:

“ It is not clear, to me at least, that he
“ thought even the imputation of idolatry, occasioned by the worship of the Son, a sufficient reason for adding the words of the same
“ *Substance with the Father* to the Creeds of the
“ Christian Churches.” p. 100.

FOR observe in what terms Bishop Burnet hath expressed himself on this head: *Exposition of the Articles, &c.* p. 3.

“ THE enlargements of Creeds were at first
“ occasioned by the prevarications of Hereticks;
“ who having put senses favouring their opi-
“ nions

" nions on the simpler terms in which the first
 " Creeds were proposed, therefore it was thought
 " necessary to add more express words. And
 " this was *absolutely necessary* as to some points;
 " for it being necessary to shew that the Chris-
 " tian Religion did not bring in that idolatry
 " which it condemned in heathens, it was also
 " necessary to state this matter so, that it
 " should appear that they worshipped no crea-
 " ture; but that the person to whom all agreed
 " to pay Divine adoration was truly God; and
 " it being found that an equivocation was used
 " in all other words except that of the *same Sub-*
 " *stance*, they judged it necessary to fix on it,
 " besides some other words that they at first
 " brought in, but which were afterwards cor-
 " rupted by the glosses that were put on them.
 " At all times it is *very necessary* to free the
 " Christian Religion from the imputations of
 " idolatry; but this was *never so necessary*, as
 " when Christianity was engaged in such a
 " struggle with paganism: and since the main
 " article then in dispute with the heathens
 " was idolatry, and the lawfulness of worship-
 " ping any besides the Great and Eternal God,
 " it was of the *last importance to the Christian*
 " Cause,

“ Cause, to take care that the heathens might
 “ have no reason to believe that they worship-
 “ ped a creature. *There was therefore just rea-*
 “ son given to secure this main point, and to put
 “ an end to equivocation, by establishing a term,
 “ which, by the confession of all parties, did not
 “ admit of any.”

Was the writer of the Confessional * ignorant
 of all this? Or was he playing the Jesuit? Cer-
 tainly not ignorant; for he quotes part of the
 paragraph in which the words above cited are
 contained: nor playing the Jesuit; for who so
 successful in catching prevaricators as he? But
 if a blear eyed editor, who saw the least where
 the light was strongest, hath confused himself
 about Bishop Burnet's opinion, and then ven-
 tured to interpose his own judgement; what
 can the learned author do more, than la-
 ment, as perhaps his *Venerable Mother* may do,
 that he hath trusted a disingenuous or wrong-
 headed friend?

THE same Gentleman, as I imagine, with
 the like discernment hath pronounced upon the

* See Confessional; p. 275.

meaning of the word *Hell* in the days of the compilers of the Articles; at which time, he assures us, it never signified any thing but the place of torments. p. 182.

THE translation of the Great English Bible, the Psalter of which is still retained in the Book of Common Prayer, was *set forth and used in the time of King Henry the eighth, and Edward the sixth* *. These, I presume, were *the days of the compilers*, and that the word *Hell* signified in their days, as it is made to signify in this translation.

Now in the *Great Bible*, Job xiv. 13. is thus rendered :

“ O ! that thou woldest kepe and hyde me
“ in the hell, untill thy wrath were stilled.”

In the Psalter, Psalm xxx. 3. in this manner :

“ Thou, Lord, hast brought my soule out
“ of hell; thou hast kept my life from them
“ that go downe to the pyt.”

* See *The Order how the Psalter is appointed to be read before the Book of Common Prayer.*

AND Psalm lxxxix. 48. thus :

“ WHAT man is he that lyveth and shall not
“ se death ? and shall he delyver hys soule from
“ the hande of hell ? ”

IT is certain that the translator of this verse in Job by the word *Hell* meant not *the place of torments*, but either the grave, or the place or state of the dead. And the same thing is highly probable of the translator of these and other passages of the Psalms, where the *grave* is substituted for *hell* in the last translation.

So confident an assertion therefore of “ *The words hell and inferi never signifying any thing in the days of the compilers but the place of torments,* ” (p. 182.) could not proceed from the judicious and knowing author, but must have been inserted by somebody better versed in *The Historical and Critical Essay on the Thirty-nine Articles*, or in the *History of the Puritans*, than in old English translations of the Bible, or in the Psalter used in the established Church.

ONE might indeed have expected a little accuracy from this Gentleman in speaking of Dr. Clarke ;

Clarke; but, as if it were fatal to him to mistake, he hath set Dr. Clarke at variance with Dr. Bennet, where they are good friends. On the Article of Christ's descending into hell, Dr. Clarke, following Bishop Pearson, says, * "His soul departed into the state of separate souls." This explication of Bishop Pearson is admitted by Dr. Bennet, who excludes only † *that sense of the word hell, which says, that by hell is meant the grave.* The same sense of the word *hell* is here rejected by Dr. Clarke; because, says he, "according to this notion the inserting of this latter part of the Article after the preceding words *Dead and Buried* would have been a mere tautology." How then is Dr. Bennet contrary to Dr. Clarke on this Article, as he is affirmed to be in the Confessional? p. 164.

BUT I will not trespass any farther on your learned leisure; unless it be to beg your kind directions in specifying to me, upon what parts of your *own*, or on what editions of the works of *others*, cited in the Confessional, I may de-

* Clarke's Exposition of the Church Catechism, p. 88. Scripture Doctrine, &c. 1st Edit. p. 421.

† Bennet's Directions for studying the Thirty-nine Articles, p. 51.

THE CONFESSIONAL. 29

pend as genuine and authentic. If, after all, I have the writings of these authors just as they intended to publish them, it is but the more apparent, that you have not been well treated by your publisher; and that he hath adulterated your true sterling with a baser metal.

You yourself “ have not willingly and knowingly misrepresented any thing. You have “ cited authorities fairly and candidly.” p. 316.

WHAT injury to these *fair* and *candid* intentions of so *stout a Champion* of the protestant cause, that somebody hath gone counter to them, even under the sanction of your respectable name! That he hath represented things, not as they are, but as he thought most suitable to his purpose; and thus, with the fatality of a certain hero in the Tale of a Tub, who endeavoured as much as possible to avoid his brother Peter, and yet was perpetually meeting him, hath run into the embraces of † *Father Phillips*!

I am, SIR, &c.

† See Confessional, 2d Edition, p. 407.

T H E E N D.

and as genuine and authentic. It is after all, I have the writings of these authors just as they intended to publish them, it is but the more apparent that you have not been well treated by your publisher, and that he hath adulterated your true feeling with a paler metal.

You yourself "have not willingly and knowingly misrepresented any thing. You have cited authorities fairly and candidly." p. 316.

WHAT injury to the fair and candid intentions of so stout a Champion of the Protestant cause, that somebody hath gone counter to them, even under the sanction of your respectable name! That he hath represented things, not as they are, but as he thought most suitable to his purpose; and thus, with the fatality of a certain hero in the Tale of a Tub, who endeavoured as much as possible to avoid his brother Peter, and yet was perpetually meeting him, hath run into the embraces of + Father Twiss!

I am, SIR, &c.

+ See Confessional, 2d Edition, p. 407.

T H E E N D.